



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

Pa

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,885	09/19/2000	Richard Rubin	4138-A1	5127
7590	03/06/2002			
Robert A Parsons Parsons & Goltry Suite 260 340 East Palm Lane Phoenix, AZ 85004			EXAMINER GARBE, STEPHEN P	
			ART UNIT 3727	PAPER NUMBER
			DATE MAILED: 03/06/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Tc

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/664,885	RUBIN, RICHARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.</p>	<p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>
--	---

Art Unit: 3727

1. The sentence, "The lips that define the open end of pouch 11 can be shallow of lips 30 and 31 if desired," in lines 12 and 13 on page 10 is objected to as being unclear. What does "shallow of lips" mean? The sentence beginning in line 3 on page 11 is objected to as being inaccurate. It appears that "between" at the end of line 6 should be changed to "through."

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 8-10, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Attaway, U.S. Patent No. 5,775,530. Attaway discloses all claimed structural features including lips having a passive, non-sealing engagement at 110 and superimposed layers of cloth 300 and insulating material 302. The statements of function and intended use do not impart any structure to the claimed apparatus that is not disclosed by Attaway. Furthermore, claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Danly*, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). "[A]pparatus claims cover what a device *is*, not what a device *doesHewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990). (emphasis in original)

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5-7, 11-13, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Attaway, U.S. Patent No. 5,775,530 in view of Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No 4,919,300. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Attaway's apparatus with hook and loop closure elements, as taught by Anderson et al. in Figure 5 (see col. 2, line 66-col. 3, line 1), because they would provide an additional measure of security to Attaway's container. Regarding the claims that require the closure elements to be supported by the lips, it is submitted that Anderson teaches this. Alternatively, the particular location would have been an obvious matter of choice.

6. The remaining patents are cited to show other devices having similar features.

7. Applicant's arguments filed with the reply have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's comments under the heading, "Prosecution History" have been read and considered. All of the limitations in applicant's claims, including the functional and intended use limitations, were considered while writing the above rejections. In making the "102" rejections, the claims were not dissected and nothing was removed from them. The functional limitations were considered for what structure they add to the claims. When a prior art reference discloses all of the structure recited in an article claim, no functional limitation in the claim can patentably define over that reference because claims directed to apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Danly*, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). "[A]pparatus claims cover what a device *is*, not what a device

*does."* *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990). (emphasis in original) If applicant thinks that a functional limitation in any of the above rejected claims defines structure not present in the applied references, he is invited to particularly point out what that structure is.

8. One of the objectives of the patent examination process is to clearly establish the meaning of any allowed claim so that the public is apprised of the scope of the patent coverage. Thus, if applicant intends for a statement of function or intended use to impart structure to a claimed apparatus, at a minimum, that structure must be clearly pointed out. However, it is preferable that the structure, itself, be recited in the claim so that competitors in the art to which the patent is directed do not have to speculate about its scope.

9. The arguments directed to Campbell are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this application or proceeding should be directed to Stephen Garbe who can be reached at 703-308-1207. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday between the hours of 7:15 and 4:45 and alternate Fridays between the hours of 7:15 and 3:45.

12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lee Young, can be reached on 703-308-2572.

13. The fax phone numbers for Technology Center 3700 are 703-872-9302 for papers filed in response to a non-final Office Action and 703-872-9303 for papers filed in response to a Final Office Action.

14. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist, whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.



Stephen P. Garbe  
Primary Examiner  
Group 3720